Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/660,392	KANGASNIEMI ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Matthew O Savage	1724

All Participants:

(1) _Matthew O Savage_.

(2) _Mr. Christopher H. Hunter_.

Date of Interview: _23 August 2004_

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant   ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes   ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 2, 9, 14, and 17.

Prior art documents discussed:

None.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

_____
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Agreed to amend line 7 of claim 1 to provide antecedence for "the piston" recited on line 11 of the claim. Agreed to change "a piston" to --said piston" on line 4 of claim 2 since antecedence for the element had been provided for in claim 1. Agreed to amend claim 9 to clearly recite the filter as being capable filtering either fuel or luboil of a motor. Agreed to amend claim 14 to clearly specify the "means for providing" as including the "valve means". The examiner noted that "means for providing" recited in claim 13 did not invoke the constraints of 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph since claim 14 further substantially structurally defined the "means for providing" as including the "valve means". Agreed to amend claim 17 to depend from claim 1 as opposed to canceled claim 3. See the attached examiner's amendment for details..